DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 890 HE 006 072

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Sutton, Francis X.; And Others |
| TITLE | Internationalizing Higher Education: A United States Approach. Occasional Paper No. 13. |
| INSTITUTION | International Council for Educational Development, New York, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | 74 |
| NOTE | 49p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Area Studies; *Comparative Education; Educational Needs; Educational Responsibility; *Foreign Countries; Government Role; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *International Education; School Community Relationship |

ABSTRACT

Three papers concerned with internationalizing higher education in the U.S. are presented with a commentary giving a Swedish perspective. The first paper, The International Role of the University in the Decades Ahead, emphasizes the need for area studies that will contribute to the general and liberal education of students. The second paper, Reflections on the Internationalizing of Higher Education, suggests the need for universal values and stresses it is the university's responsibility to strengthen its capacity to direct its own internationalization and to educate governments and citizenries concerning the role and value of higher education. The third paper, Graduate Education, International Studies, and the National Interest, indicates that graduate education and international studies have become too far removed from the society that supports them. A viable relation with government and society is now the task of the modern university. (MJM)

ED 060072

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Internationalizing Higher Education: A United States Approach

Francis X. Sutton
F. Champion Ward
James A. Perkins

With a Commentary by
Bertil Östergren

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

HE 001 607

I|C
E|D
International Council for Educational Development

Occasional Paper Number 13

Copyright © by International Council for Educational Development 1974
Printed in U.S.A. September 1974

3/4

## FOREWORD

At a time when our foreign policy needs our most careful attention, there are the loudest cries of neglect from the students thereof. When our most pressing problems require international solutions, the country drifts toward isolation. At a time when increased understanding is badly needed, with several notable exceptions financial support has been strangled at its source.

But before we can agree on a therapy, we must agree on a diagnosis. Earlier in the year I attempted a partial answer only to discover that two of my friends in the Ford Foundation had produced answers of their own. We felt that publishing the three together might present some useful comparisons in both assumptions and content.

At this point I remembered that Sweden was undertaking a major review of the role of education in producing citizens who are internationally literate. So I asked Bertil Östergren to write a commentary from his vantage point.

It is to be hoped that these three papers and the Swedish critique will find a useful place in the coming debate on the new definition of the national interest.

James A. Perkins
Chairman
International Council for
Educational Development

# The International Role of the University in the Decades Ahead: Prospects and Realities

Francis X. Sutton
Deputy Vice President,
International Division,
The Ford Foundation

I will try to be brief and broad at the same time, hoping to come somewhere in reasonable length and with intelligible shape to the breadth. I want to address myself to the future, which I take it is the theme of this concluding discussion, by beginning with some thoughts about trends at the present time. One hears a great deal about the turning inward that is now going on in the United States, in contrast to an era in which there was much more abundant and easy enthusiasm about international matters. The meaning of this alleged change is anything but clear, but it is a starting point that we in the foundation world think about a great deal.

The other day I was at a meeting in Dubrovnik on the Adriatic, a lovely spot that I recommend to all of you. It is

---

This paper was delivered at a conference on "The International Role of the University in the 1970s," sponsored by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, with the support of ICED, and held at the University, May 17–19, 1973.

an old city-state with splendid Renaissance architecture. It is now a very popular place for tourists, and the mayor not long ago feared that this lucrative invasion was turning his whole citizenry into waiters and chambermaids. Thinking that he should do something, he decided to promote an international university center that might bring some elevating diversity to his city. He engaged the interest of the University of Zagreb. As Dubrovnik is part of Croatia, the university in Croatia's capital was a natural place for him to turn.

An impressive effort to establish an international center at Dubrovnik has resulted. I was there with a group of people from many parts of the world, including an array of people from the United States representing such diverse institutions as the University of Chicago, Portland State College, Fairleigh Dickinson, and Florida State. I asked myself, What are all these people from American institutions doing here? What are their interests in Dubrovnik? They were, I should add, flanked by representatives from Scandinavian universities, from German universities, and from other parts of the world. There was quite clearly an eager international response to the initiative that the mayor of Dubrovnik had taken and that the University of Zagreb had advanced on his behalf. I was sufficiently interested in this response that I fear I spent more time trying to understand the motivations of the participants than I did on what was being decided at the conference.

I was chiefly struck by the fact that many of the American representatives were being pushed by the eager interests of students in the United States to find opportunities for study abroad. I had seen evidences of this pressure in other places and was once again impressed that something important for the future lies in this continuing—and perhaps increasing—impulse of American students to study abroad. Undoubtedly many of you see this phenomenon more closely than I do and can better assess its roots and strength. But I count it as

powerful evidence against any radical American turn from international interests. Pressure from undergraduates was, of course, not the only reason for the good attendance at Dubrovnik. Some were area specialists seeking opportunities for advanced study of Yugoslavia and adjacent areas. Another strong interest was evident in those who were seeking common study of problems they have at home and that they share with other nations. Making an agenda for the center out of so many interests was no easy task, but there was an engaging eagerness on all sides to do so.

Amid this happy cosmopolitanism there were, however, reminders of contrary tendencies. I had an opportunity when I was in Dubrovnik to talk at some length with the Rector of the University of Zagreb, and was grateful for some glimpses of higher education in Yugoslavia that he gave me. The University of Zagreb, I learned, is the kind of institution where practically all of the professors were students in Zagreb and then continued their professional careers there. They have very few people from other Yugoslav universities. There are occasional visitors from outside but not many, there being language difficulties. They regard it as natural that the student body should come very largely from Zagreb, and they are very busy, as we are in this country, providing outriggers to the university so that people in towns like Split can have their own local branch and ultimately open an independent university. Thinking ahead, I found myself wondering if the staff at Split might not in a few years be mostly people who went through the institution in that city.

One might perhaps think this strongly local tendency of universities to be peculiar to a federal Yugoslavia. But it appears in fact not to be, as many of you know who go around the world. I could give you several examples, but I cite only one. In Pakistan's higher education there has recently been an insistence upon the use not merely of the national language in preference to English, but of provincial



9

languages as well. For example, students in the University of Sind not long ago won the right to take their examinations in Sindi, despite the fact that there must not be many tens of printed books in Sindi. In forms that are normally milder, this kind of thing is going on in other parts of the world and one concludes that universities have a capacity to become expressions of a local patriotism or exclusiveness. Indeed we must conjure with the paradoxical fact that institutions with the name "university" can be spearheads of provincialism.

The eagerness of the University of Zagreb for the international collaboration being attempted at Dubrovnik was welcome reassurance that it, at least, is not satisfied to be parochial. One ventures the hope that a similar hunger for international breadth is a common counterpart to narrowing local tendencies. I believe indeed that both tendencies exist everywhere, including this country, and that there is a persisting need to balance them if higher education is to be healthy and productive. The sources and strength of these centrifugal and centripetal forces on universities seem to differ from country to country. I shall not try to talk about them in generality, but will focus on the United States.

## SHIFT IN BALANCE

The reality of some recent inward-turning in the preoccupations of our country and our universities is not to be denied, and it need not be deplored. In the era after World War II, the United States was remarkably successful and self-confident. We could and did turn our attention to the wide world with a comfortable feeling that affairs at home were in good working order. Great achievements in the international roles and competences of our universities resulted, and we can now fairly claim that our universities are genuinely concerned with the whole world for the first time. But in recent years we have been perturbed by evidences that

we, like other nations, have grave problems at home that need the best attention our universities can give them. A newly urgent attention to domestic problems and pressures implies some shift in the balance of attention. The rightness of the shift is not in question, but there have been widespread fears that it may be too sharp and swift, and damage international strengths that have only recently been built up.

The disappointment of hopes for the International Education Act, the decline of funding from the National Defense Education Act and from foundations, along with the dwindling of other support for international activities, have made the changes seem sharp indeed. There has been continuing talk of crises and much gloomy prophecy. No doubt there are many difficult passages ahead, but I would venture to suggest that some of the changes we see going on are bringing opportunities for better international roles for American universities than we have been able to achieve in the past.

## AREA STUDIES: DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Without minimizing the very great achievements of the past decades, we should not forget the serious imperfections that went along with these achievements. Two great developments in American higher education can be directly related to the nation's postwar assumption of responsibilities in world affairs. One has been the proliferation of non-Western area studies. The other has been the commitment of universities to development assistance, through AID contracts and in many other, more diffuse forms. The remarkable increase in the international activities of American universities over the past generation has had other important aspects, but these two have had great prominence.

These thrusts into development assistance and into non-

Western area studies have been anything but easy to bring together comfortably in the corpus of university activities. It was obvious to everybody several years ago that the development assistance side of university work often headed in one direction, while area or international studies were heading in another. Much effort has gone into schemes for bringing coherence into the expanding international involvement of universities. We in the Ford Foundation took a great concern with these efforts in the mid-sixties, helping to establish a wondrous array of committees, councils, deans' offices, and institutes. Some were expensive and some rather cheap; some were successful and others limped. On the whole, I judge that the overall record is positive, but not fully satisfying. There has been persisting and intrinsic difficulty that was rooted in prevailing conceptions about development assistance and international studies.

The original conception of Point Four was that there was existing technical expertise that could be applied to the problems of developing countries by our own experts and taught to the nationals of the developing countries. We thought for some time that we could straightforwardly export our agriculturists, engineers, public health doctors, and other specialists, and that we could train people from developing countries more or less as our own people had been trained. So conceived, the process did not intrinsically have a deep intellectual challenge in it, and development assistance tended to be viewed as a "service" activity of American universities. We have always been proud that our universities provide service, and its extension across the seas offered much excitement and reward. But service needs to be linked to the research and teaching functions of universities, and there has been persisting disquiet in the universities about how well this was being done with development assistance.

The other aspect of the great internationalization of

American universities had a different starting point—in the concern that we understand areas of the world which had become important in our foreign policy and our international responsibilities. Initially, its principal aim was the building of cadres of American specialists on exotic places—on India or the Arab countries, or Africa. There was not much concern with the instruction or assistance of people from elsewhere. I will not dwell on the resulting proliferation of area studies centers and programs, or on the many familiar problems of their relationships to established departments and disciplines. These organizational achievements and problems have perhaps taken more of our time and attention than they should. Under them has lain the deeper and more important question of the place of scholarship on foreign areas in the body of liberal and specialist learning that is the business of universities. To produce specialists for a set of national needs has been a worthy service. But it could not comfortably continue unless some of these specialists found a natural and accepted place in the universities themselves. This has, in fact, been a capital problem, since as we all have vaguely known, and Professor Richard Lambert has now exhaustively verified, the largest number of our specialists on non-Western areas now find their occupation in universities.

The efforts at coherent ordering of universities' international activities have taken the obvious course of trying to bring some strategic oversight and executive control on these activities that were clearly international. Thus there have been efforts to link undertakings and experience in development assistance with area studies programs, and more comprehensively to such matters as the handling of foreign students, study abroad, and exchange programs. While such efforts may have been essential when international activities were growing at explosive rates, they often represented a striving for neat and intelligible patterns that did not naturally emerge, for reasons I hope at least to have suggested.

The changes that are now upon us seem to me to promise easier and more natural integration of international activities with other university activities and thus quieter times for earnest deans. The reasons lie partly in our humbled awareness of our own imperfections and our international dependencies, as well as a new appreciation of the subtleties and difficulties of development. As we have become more concerned about domestic problems, there has simultaneously come a blurring of distinctions between what is domestic and what is international. In part this is a consequence of the growing interdependence of national economies that many nations have felt longer than we have, but that now, in energy crises, monetary problems, and much else, affects the United States too. In part it arises because of a sense that others have dealt with problems like ours and may have learned things we should know; we talk more and more of common problems and bring more international comparisons into the scrutiny of domestic problems. The so-called advanced, industrialized societies naturally assume heightened interest in these comparisons, but new kinds of intellectual interest in the developing countries have appeared too. Old simplicities have now given way to an appreciation of the extent to which development problems require new knowledge and the sensitive adaptation of general principles and techniques to the particularities of individual countries. Mere transfer of knowledge and technique will not do; and the job of finding this knowledge presents new challenges to established disciplines.

There has been temptation to believe that the new sophistication of development assistance promises happy marriages between development and area specialists. I am by no means sure that this will happen. I rather suspect that our economists, hydrologists, agronomists, and all the multifarious array of disciplinary specialists will never be meshed neatly with scholars on the areas where they happen to be

working. What is essential, and more likely, is that their approaches to their own subject matters be based on more generous assumptions about cultural and situational relativity, and an appreciation of the need for international comparisons and collaboration. One can envisage a new era in which old subjects are revived as we struggle to deal better with them under the awareness that different countries go about them differently. Experience with both advanced and developing countries should in this way be no mere appendage to the study of these subjects in the United States, but an organic part of deepened and more generalized approaches to them.

If this perspective is a true one, it promises better intellectual challenges from development assistance and better absorption of experience from it into the ongoing work of universities. But what about the area specialists? The course of their natural absorption seems to me a somewhat different one, probably more linked to liberal than to specialized learning, and more closely relevant to the instructional than to the research role of universities.

## FUTURE OF AREA STUDIES

I have said that area studies programs began with the aim of training specialists for the national need. We have now remedied many national dearths, and the future of area studies must depend more on their contribution to the general and liberal education of the students in our universities. The prospects look encouraging. The non-Western area specialist has long suffered under a burden of exoticism. He has been a man who knew things that ordinary men did not need to know to go about their ordinary lives. He has thus been a "mere" specialist, or worse, a curious fellow who busied himself with less worthy ways of living than ours. The

heartening internationalism of modern youth is knocking apart these old conceptions. Better worldwide communications and a vigorous egalitarianism that refuses to concede that exotic humanity must be irrelevant or inferior, are giving the promise of education that is universal in spirit and outlook.

Usually when we talk about universal education we mean the education of everybody, not education that takes account of all humanity. There is indeed some reason to question if the two go comfortably together. The narrowing tendencies in university education that I mentioned earlier, with illustrations from Yugoslavia and Pakistan, have something to do with the universalization of educational opportunity. The old principles that nations meet at their tops, and elites have more disposition to cosmopolitanism, have had substance to them. The less advantaged have, by practical necessity and social expectation, had shorter gazes. It would be surprising and indeed wrong if a higher education serving more people did not show the imprint of these people's needs and their own languages. But if one effect is to emphasize local need and interest, there is another that is broadening and internationalizing. It comes from the egalitarian and democratic spirit which, in bringing new opportunities at home brings new regard for humanity everywhere. A condescending view of exotic peoples and a self-satisfied regard for our own traditions accords badly with this universalistic and democratic temper. The way is opened to a respect for cultures and traditions from all parts of the world. We have seen in the last years astonishing sales of the *I Ching*, youngsters migrating to Al Azhar to learn Arabic and the Koran, and followers of Krishna in our city streets. Probably not many of our youth will take up such remarkable devotions. They will be content with more conventional study abroad and lesser encounters with non-Western traditions, but the receptivity and need now appear very general.

It can only be guided and satisfied by universities that have scholars with a serious command of societies and traditions that are hard to know well. The future employment of area specialists now occasions anxiety in many quarters. But if the future teaching of history, literature, the social sciences—indeed the whole panoply of liberal education—is to be done in a style appropriate to the late 20th century world, they should have plenty to do, and the old problems of supporting them as "mere specialists" should, not long hence, seem a curious memory of simpler times.

# Reflections on the "Internationalizing" of Higher Education

F. Champion Ward
Program Advisor in Education,
International Division,
The Ford Foundation

Before I try to identify some issues around which discussion of my assigned subject might turn, I will give a brief account of the recent history of the effort to internationalize higher education in my own country, where the undertaking has been more or less deliberate and, for two decades, rather well supported by both public and private sources.

But first a reminder that the nationalization of universities is not necessarily to be seen as a natural state requiring deliberate and special efforts for its alteration. We need only think of the international character of the medieval universities in Europe, or of Al Azhar in the Middle East, or of the forest universities of ancient India, to realize that universities are not inherently parochial. Moreover, in contemporary Latin America, there is enough passage of scholars and

---

This paper was prepared for discussion at a meeting of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR), in Caracas, Venezuela, March 3–8, 1974.

scientists across national lines to suggest that even in the era of nation-states, such traffic is natural. And we all know that universities, however much they may be nationalized, are far less destructible than most of the regimes that nationalize them. In fact, perhaps the only modern institution more enduring than a university is an academic department.[1]

Yet, not only are the nationalizing tendencies of the present day unusually strong, but the scale on which internationalization seems to me to be required is unprecedented. In the case of the United States, at least, the world after World War II presented new and exacting demands of exceptional urgency, and it is the response to these demands which I wish to describe briefly.

It is a measure of our present distance from an adequate internationalism in higher education that I must apologize for the provincial origin of these reflections in the recent experience of my own country. If the universities of the world already constituted a string of beacons throwing the same light on man and nature everywhere, it would not be necessary to concede, as I find I must, that much of what I have to say will have its greatest relevance to the recent history of higher education in the United States. Yet I am consoled as to the general relevance of the case of the United States when I consider the example of India. As early as the nineteen-fifties, the Government of India helped the University of Delhi to establish a department of African Studies. A department of Chinese Studies followed in the sixties, and now one hears of current explorations of the possibilities for

---

[1] Although the National University in one Latin American country was closed during a recent strike, the Department of Mathematics, being of another opinion, remained open.

Latin American Studies in India, and vice versa. India now reserves scholarships in her universities for students from developing countries, and although there is no official technical assistance agency, many Indian teachers and specialists have served as advisors and teachers in other developing countries.

In some ex-colonial countries, universities had been "internationalized" without ever having been nationalized. Thus, in some countries of Africa, the first order of business after independence was achieved was to develop African Studies, and it is only now that an African university can begin the study of areas more remote from its former European master, which was studied too much, and its own country and continent, which were studied too little.

The two broad reasons for the effort of the United States to reduce the parochialism of its universities and colleges after the Second World War were the emergence of the United States and the Soviet Union as the global adversaries predicted long ago by Tocqueville, and the postwar recession of the European colonial empires through which, as through a glass darkly, Asia and Africa had been theretofore perceived and dealt with by the rest of the world. It seemed obvious that in an interactive world which had become the theatre of great power competition throughout its length, an inexperienced "superpower" would require whole new flocks of journalists, social scientists, international businessmen, diplomats, and intelligence analysts with specialized capabilities to inform public and private policy and opinion concerning what were called "non-Western areas and cultures." Therefore, new knowledge and skills were sought to be developed through such public means as the National Defense Education Act and such private means as the Ford Foundation's International Training and Research Fellowships.

In addition to this effort, the U. S. Government and some of the foundations also sought to provide technical assistance to the former European colonies in Asia and Africa, and this involved a substantial movement of American scholars and scientists to developing countries, in the roles of technical advisors and temporary practitioners. Although both of these efforts were undertaken in the national interest, the attitudes of scrutiny and analysis, on the one hand, and of helping to bring about "development" on the other, were distinct enough to have been separately supported and to have had distinguishable histories over the last twenty years.

When they are compared with their condition following the Second World War, I think it can fairly be said that the U. S. universities and the society served by them are now far less provincial than they would have been without this deliberate national investment in "non-Western studies" and development assistance. Yet, for all that, the internationalization of higher education in the United States still bears the marks of its political origin. That origin is betrayed in a number of ways. (1) There has been a tendency to concentrate attention on current tendencies in present-day societies, particularly insofar as they can be grasped by modern social science, to the relative neglect of such subjects as history, religion, literature, philosophy and ancient languages. (2) There has been a tendency to concentrate upon those areas which in some sense might be considered politically strategic. (An apparent exception is the neglect of Indo-Chinese studies, but is it not more likely that U. S. intervention in that area was encouraged by ignorance of what would happen in the absence of intervention? So that an area *became* "strategic" through having been ignored as non-strategic.) (3) In taking part, as advisors and technicians, in development assistance, universities and university men have found it difficult to decide whether that kind of *praxis* deserves a place in the university or should be treated as an

interruption of proper academic pursuits in order to perform a political or philanthropic service.

For all of these reasons, there has emerged an uneasy feeling that, in spite of the relative spaciousness of what has resulted from this national effort, "the idea of a university" has somehow been blurred or even twisted out of shape. This uneasiness has been reinforced by the kind of rhetoric considered necessary to secure support for the study of new subjects and languages from officials and politicians, who have been thought not to be capable of investing in education or knowledge for their own sakes, or, in Nurse Cavell's phrase, of putting "humanity above the nations."

And now we are seeing that the argument from national interest can backfire in times of internal difficulty for a nation-state. In such times, universities and professors are invited to focus their knowledge and assistance on problems of their own society. Thus, if the matter is left to national policy makers, preoccupation with internal troubles, combined with global détente, could actually reduce the level of "internationalism" reached since the Second World War.

My colleague, Francis Sutton, has recently characterized the current state of tension between nationalizing and internationalizing influences on higher education.* As tendencies encouraging internationalism, he cites the attitudes of the rising generation of the West, which does not instinctively divide the world between familiar and exotic halves, and the increasing recognition of problems common to many societies which no one nation or culture has yet solved. Mr. Sutton cites as narrowing tendencies the rediscovery of

*Mr. Ward refers to Mr. Sutton's paper reprinted in this volume.

subcultures and their local peculiarities within national societies, and the tendency, particularly in Asia, to localize the staffs and student bodies of provincial universities employing provincial languages, as higher education expands.

Mr. Sutton also points to an encouraging lessening of the tensions within higher education between area studies and development assistance as these were originally distinguished, holding that development assistance is now no longer regarded as simply the export and application of ready-made technology, but as presenting a "deep intellectual challenge." In response to this challenge, he predicts that "old subjects" will be broadened and that "one can envisage a new era in which old subjects are revived as we struggle to deal better with them under the awareness that different countries go about them differently. Experience with both advanced and developing countries should in this way be no mere appendage to the study of these subjects in the United States, but an organic part of deepened and more generalized approaches to them."

As for area specialists, he believes that they are viewed as less exotic now, that they are more seriously incorporated into the fabric of universities, and that their principal further effect on universities is likely to be at the teaching level, where undergraduates are prepared to be citizens of an interdependent world.

## NEED FOR UNIVERSAL VALUES

If this is broadly where matters now stand, what is the unfinished business to which those concerned with the "internationalization" of higher education should now address themselves? I see these problems as in part theoretical, having to do with the ends of higher education, and in

part practical, having to do with the ways in which the behavior of universities may come to conform more fully and stably with their stated ends than they do at present.

We saw that resting internationalism in higher education on "reasons of state" can backfire. National interest as defined by political leaders and parties may point away from internationalism as well as toward it. It is time, therefore, for internationalism in higher education to be grounded in the very idea of a university, and I believe that this idea must rest, in turn, on a universal view of knowledge and value.

Against a universal view of knowledge and value strong counter-influences other than the political chauvinism of the nation-state are presently working. There is much insistence upon the uniqueness of the value system of each human culture or subculture. From this current piety toward the variety of human value systems, it is only a step to the notion of each university as reflecting the unique values of the culture which it serves. On this premise, internationalism in higher education could become, not a sharing of common values but, at most, a mutual display of cultural differences.

In the present age, with its valid fears of dependency and neo-imperialism, this mutual deference, this agreeing to differ, has its attractions, particularly for young and vulnerable nations. Yet I suggest that it is a halfway house only, a moment of unstable equilibrium en route to a world system of shared values. For I believe that what is unique to a culture is relatively trivial, and that a university which gives precedence to what is culturally unique will itself be trivialized, as if a Scottish university should center its study and practice of music in the bagpipes.

A university, then, should subscribe to values which are not culture-bound. But if it does center itself in what is

actually or potentially universal, it may find itself at odds with the political state which gives it support. This in two senses. It will have to insist that what is humanly valuable may be found in foreign cultures as well as its own, a view not quickly applauded by national authorities. And insofar as what is universal is often thought to be impractical, it may find the same authorities reluctant to support its "useless" activities.

## "INTERNATIONALIZATION" ULTIMATELY TASK OF UNIVERSITIES

This prospect brings me to the range of practical tasks which appear to face universities aspiring to full universality. I would divide these into intramural attempts to widen the range of their curricula, faculty, and research, and extramural efforts to strengthen their capacity to direct their own "internationalization" and to educate governments and citizenries concerning the role and value of higher education.

In curriculum, particularly the curriculum for undergraduates, the business of extending the education of the rising generation beyond what George Santayana once called "the frontiers of Christendom and respectability"[2] remains in large part unfinished. In some quarters, even the case for an internationalized curriculum has not been made out. In

---

[2] "Brief History of My Opinions," *Contemporary American Philosophers*, New York: Macmillan and Co., 1930. Vol. II, p. 240. Santayana added that in his youthful imagination what we now call the non-Western world consisted of "interminable ocean spaces, cocoanut islands, blameless Malays, and immense continents swarming with Chinamen, polished and industrious, obscene and philosophical."

others, theoretical conviction has so far led only to fragmentary and fragile beginnings. At the present juncture, I suggest that universities which wish to move farther in this direction will need to do two things. First, ways must be found to enable members of their present faculties in the social sciences and humanities to add a degree of specialized knowledge of non-Western societies and cultures sufficient to enable their teaching (if not necessarily their research) to be extended beyond the boundaries within which they were originally trained. Two-year sabbaticals in mid-career might be an effective means to this end. Second, nationals from non-Western societies should be included in their faculties to help widen the curricula for undergraduates.

In the case of research, comparative studies, involving where possible collaboration of scholars and scientists of other societies, should be encouraged. It would be salutary for one and all if the knowledge each society has of itself and even the definition of its social problems, were regularly unsettled and informed by the detached contributions of scholars and scientists of external origin. I think in this connection of the striking contributions made to the self-understanding of my own society by such foreign observers as Alexis de Tocqueville in the nineteenth century and Gunnar Myrdal in the twentieth. And I believe that the exercise of a discipline in more than one's own society is helpful in distinguishing what is accidental from what is essential in that discipline's professed universality. (I recall the no doubt extreme case of one Western economist who, after a traumatic exposure to the economic problems of a number of "developing" countries, concluded that "There is no economics; there are only economies.")

I am aware that what I am advocating goes against the nationalizing tendencies which are now current and perhaps

on the increase. Universities in developing countries, for example, are being urged to make themselves useful to national development, and their faculties are said to be constrained in their response to this challenge by their allegiance to the international norms and status symbols of their disciplines.

But is self-isolation the cure for this condition? It would seem more promising (as I understand Mr. Sutton to be suggesting) to arrange for selective, carefully scaled collaboration in comparative research among national and other scholars and scientists, the latter drawn from other countries having comparable problems and from intellectual centers in which experience in attacking such problems is compiled, critically assessed, and reported upon.

The foregoing reference to selective and carefully scaled collaboration brings me to one of the extramural tasks now to be faced by higher education. For as long as funds for financing collaborative research are spent at the discretion of the non-national researchers or their funders, in the universities of "developing" societies the balance between national and non-national researchers will be chronically distorted in "favor" of the non-nationals. Proper scaling and casting of collaborative research and curriculum development will not be assured until the host universities and host scholars and scientists control these matters themselves.

And this brings me to the "extramural" task of the universities, referred to above. I believe that the postwar history of the "internationalization" of higher education makes it clear that henceforth the universities must themselves make the case for "internationalization" and must themselves manage its further realization. Until the universities debate and clarify the issues touched on in this paper

with far greater vigor and tenacity than they have devoted to these issues to date, and until they persuade themselves and their financial supporters that their value to their societies is to expand the national consciousness, not simply to reinforce it, they will be subject to the endless and unpredictable ebb and flow of circumstance, including, *faute de mieux*, the infliction upon them of the views of foundation executives at international conferences.

# Graduate Education, International Studies, and the National Interest

James A. Perkins
Chairman,
International Council for
Educational Development

30

Graduate education and international studies are under external pressure from new national priorities and internal pressure from new educational preoccupations. Perhaps the highest pressure point is where new external and internal considerations join to exert their torque on graduate education for international affairs.

Our point of departure must be the inescapable fact that both graduate education and international studies have, since World War II, grown under the benign influence of the federal government. This influence in turn was a response to a new conception of the national interest. Our country was seen as the new leader of the free world, with grave responsibilities for ensuring peace, underwriting prosperity, and promoting the establishment of the democratic idea. The

---

This paper was delivered at the dedication of L. E. Grinter Hall, Graduate School and International Studies Building, University of Florida, Gainesville, on February 14, 1974.


31

university would support this stance by housing and encouraging the scientific research necessary for our national security program, training the new specialists in international matters required to manage our worldwide responsibilities, and promoting a sophisticated view of the world scene on the part of all university graduates whose future positions of influence and affluence would be decisive in the development of our new world view.

Graduate and professional education rode upward on the thermal draft of this new federal interest (and federal funds), with a quantum jump in the budgets of science departments and professional schools. A country committed to containment (a more polite name for the cold war) through a military posture of superior force looked to the universities to win the science race and thereby, it was believed, to ensure success in the military confrontation. Even the most conservative admiral or general came to realize that fleets and armies were at the mercy of scientists who could spot ships over the horizon, wipe out an army with one bomb, and decipher coded messages that could convert a Pearl Harbor into a Battle of Midway. Warfare had become dependent on strange types sitting in laboratories producing black boxes. So financial support was forthcoming for buildings, research, fellowships—everything necessary to guarantee a clear and visible scientific leadership.

Even so, graduate education grew by gentle stages until in 1957 Sputnik produced a national shock that could be felt in the most remote classroom and laboratory. Federal money went hunting for recipients and, as the saying goes, the recipients were willing. The next decade was one of scientific expansion, scientific advisors, scientific committees. Science and scientists were the indispensable keys to our national security. And, conversely but less well understood, continued concern for our national security became the key to our growing scientific establishment.

We rode the thermal draft all right, soaring like a glider in the naive but happy belief that we needed no internal engine to keep us airborne. Like a modern Icarus we had mastered the mystery of almost effortless flight. However, to transmute a familiar phrase, we were living on borrowed air.

The same impulse was exercising its powerful pressure on the field of international studies. As the presumptive leader of the West following World War II, we found ourselves unprepared to deal with the nations of the non-Western world, be they friends or enemies. As new countries came spilling out of their colonial chrysalises, we did not even know where they were located, let alone how to pronounce their names. A candidate for an ambassadorial post was turned down because he could not remember the name of the prime minister of the country where he would be assigned. The scouting reports of an alert football coach were far more sophisticated than our knowledge of the new terrains outside our borders. So we set about to correct our large-scale ignorance.

As a result, the academic landscape became dotted with area centers established to remedy our ignorance through the production of information and of graduates skilled in languages and familiar, at least at second hand, with the culture and socioeconomic problems of countries old and new. This is not the place to chronicle the history of the flowering of graduate attention to international affairs in the fifties and sixties. It was a tremendous development that has left an indelible imprint on university education, which will never again resume its parochial ways.

But there were two built-in hazards to this expansion of our international horizons. The first was the dependence on outside funds and the second was a dependence on a public rationale that was securely tied both directly and implicitly to the cold war and U. S. worldwide responsibilities.



33

Outside financing made it unnecessary to resolve the extremely complicated problem of connecting an interdisciplinary program with departmental structures or, in administrative language, horizontal with vertical modes of organization. In the internal politics of the university the director of an area center was no match for an established departmental chairman. Knowing this to be so, foundations and later the federal government made their grants specifically to international and area programs rather than to the university as such, where the programs might get chopped up in the budgetary process.

The hazards were submerged in a rising tide of public and philanthropic support. The rocks were there to be seen if the tide should ever recede. And recede it did, with a roaring abrasion that would do justice to Matthew Arnold's "Dover Beach." The cold war began to thaw as mutual deterrence made war with Russia unthinkable. Limited war as a means of containment went bankrupt with Vietnam. And Vietnam also compromised the notion that the United States was a benign and wise leader for the Western world. American economic and cultural foreign policies were tarnished by infiltration of intelligence and counter-revolutionary activities. U. S. aid came to be viewed at home as the road to military involvement and abroad as a means of not too subtle capitalistic intervention. In short, our policies for ensuring a better world were described as ineffectual at best or, at worst, destructive of the very ideals and objectives they were designed to achieve.

## REACTION TO REDUCED FUNDING

The consequences for the university's graduate and international studies were not long in coming into clear focus. Détente with Russia led to a reduced interest in science.



34

Foreign assistance programs, including those managed by universities, ran afoul of the inescapable fact that developing countries did not want assistance on our terms of accountability to the U. S. Congress and the Congress found preposterous the idea that money could be voted on any other terms.

So the tide of federal support for scientific and international studies began to recede, leaving the academic beaches littered with expectations that could no longer be fulfilled, programs that had drawn a great deal of negative attention, and internal and external problems that required early resolution.

Of course, there were other expansionist pressures at work. The steady rise in enrollments had produced a requirement for teachers which, in turn, produced a need for the economy of the teaching assistant who was a part-time graduate student. As a result, the professor found released time for his research while the hard-pressed director of the budget found a pleasant influx of low-cost instructors. Incidentally, our presumed concern for high standards was somewhat clouded by the inadequate preparation of many of those teaching assistants, both domestic and foreign. There is more than a suspicion that an interest in low-cost labor became more important than the fear of low-standard teaching.

Somewhat the same considerations could be found in that more affluent strata of graduate students known as research assistants. While the teaching assistant was a response to the influx of students, the research assistant was a response to the influx of research funds. Government contracts provided generous allowances for laboratory assistance which could hardly be matched by the general funds of the university. There are some who felt that the scientific manager could exercise greater leverage on the government for high research

pay than could the department chairman on his dean for high teaching pay. But complaint over this apparent inequity in income scales was complicated because the research effort was financed with what was euphemistically called "outside money."

This outside funding of graduate education became a third feature of our inflated landscape. It had, and possibly still has, reached the point where no self-respecting graduate student expected to pay full or, indeed, any tuition. Graduate education combined with teaching and research became a job concerned with pay scales and with troubled thoughts about proper position in the academic community. Poised between student and faculty, graduate students existed in a twilight zone that has become more unstable as demands for participatory democracy put their ambivalent status in sharp relief. It is important to realize that the outside government financing of much of this graduate expansion blunted any desire to upset this golden apple cart with questioning of these arrangements, which might seem rude.

The first instinctive reaction to the reduction in public support was, and in some measure still is, to reestablish the status quo ante, even though the priorities that produced it had drastically changed. The desire is for more money for programs that funding agencies no longer think relevant to changing conceptions of the national interest. Those who insist on sailing the same course when the wind has changed are not likely to finish the race. Indeed they will be lucky if they are not capsized.

I am afraid too much of our collective effort has been to steer our old course in adverse winds. We have wrung our hands as support has declined with a sort of "you can't do this to us" wail of despair. It will do us no good and will only

postpone the time for a serious look at the reasons for declining support and the evolution of strategies that will clarify our role and missions.

In a presentation like this it is, of course, impossible to give any systematic and full scenario for the future of graduate and international education. But perhaps you will permit me to suggest some of the new matters and new circumstances we must address.

First of all, we must recognize that we are experiencing a massive shift in our social priorities and our definition of the national interest. The full dimensions and consequences of this shift are by no means clear, but we are aware that something profound is taking place. In the past we experienced the changes from dynastic to mercantile to security considerations as determinants in world affairs. Concern for national security within a system of states is still very much with us, but the expression of these interests is being modified by two important forces. One is the growing constraint of regional and international organizations. The other is the rising concern for new social priorities of ecology, racial justice, and the quality of life. These have altered the clear priority of attention given to military considerations.

We need a new conception of the national interest in foreign and domestic affairs that starts with and embraces our new domestic priorities. Charles Beard's *Idea of the National Interest* was the last major attempt at such a formulation and it is now hopelessly out of date. Though academic statements cannot substitute for real interests, they can sharpen issues, give visibility to important problems, and suggest models for solution. Ideas can affect action and are just as much a part of reality. Surely, our best minds must be working toward these new formulations. It is hard to see how

graduate and international education can claim support in the national interest without some more precise assumptions as to just what that interest is.

## GRADUATE EDUCATION REEXAMINED

A second task now made both possible and necessary by the retreat in federal funding is the constructive reexamination of graduate education apart from the demands for teaching and research assistants. At least three such studies are now under way. Preliminary reports indicate that they have become too preoccupied with the question of scholarly neutrality versus social concern. It is to be hoped that one or all of them will recognize that neutrality and concern have to be properly meshed. It brings to mind the great phrase of Northrop Frye, "Concern prevents detachment from degenerating into indifference."

But behind the polemics of style and stance, there remains the necessary consideration of a new balance in the great fields of knowledge. The opportunity for this is present, now that science is no longer such an overriding consideration. But the social sciences and the humanities cannot successfully claim equal attention just by announcing their inherent right to attention. That right must be demonstrated and supported. There are signs that this is slowly coming about. Humanists are increasingly willing to recognize that a humanist does not become humane merely by reason of his title. Similarly a social scientist is neither social nor scientific by reason of his. All must show their capacity to contribute to the illumination of real-life problems. And graduate study must demonstrate how and in what ways it adds both to the understanding and to the preparation of the individual graduate student. It is not enough for teachers to show a connection with national purpose or student demand. The

actual contribution of the graduate experience to the graduate student himself is the neglected concern. Society will not support such neglect forever.

There is also the unresolved problem of the proper role of graduate experience in the preparation of the teacher, particularly the college teacher. It may be good academic dogma that anyone who knows his subject can teach it, but this proposition is to confuse the necessary and the sufficient condition. Knowledge of the subject is necessary but not sufficient. Interest in students, concern for what they have learned, imagination in presentation—all are required qualities. Just ask any student.

When students were pressing on scarce places, the satisfaction of admission overrode the bleakness of the learning experience. The appearance of unfilled places is now turning attention to the student who demands more of his professor who, in turn, finds that his training of new teachers could be improved. Returning to a football analogy, one is impressed at the intense care taken by the football coach who spends hours reviewing the performance of his players, including film records of successes and failures. Analogies are dangerous, we know. But a student newspaper recently noted that student unrest would cease overnight if a professor of economics would give a student the same close and corrective attention as his basketball coach does. The idea does not seem far-fetched to our students.

Another consequence of the new realism will be to force an integration or at least a meshing of gears between the department-managed disciplines and the international and area centers. Special outside funding coming directly to these programs will continue but on a reduced scale. So they must be prepared to compete and compete vigorously for their share of the university dollar. To do so they must establish

their mission in post-cold war terms and in a manner that embraces our new domestic priorities and our foreign policy. They must proclaim their value as an interdisciplinary style in a setting that is dominated by the disciplines. They must widen their clientele to include all those private interests that have wide international activities and interests—corporate business, the media, international transportation, and international agencies as well as scholarly research enterprises.

This brings us to a final point. Graduate education and international studies have become too far removed from the society that supports them. In affluent times it could be assumed that academic study and research were supported as entities in themselves. The connection between the intellectual establishment and society was not publicly stated, and thus the assumption mistakenly made was that such a connection did not exist and did not need to exist. But this connection became all too clear when we discovered that established public purposes had fallen into disfavor.

How to construct a viable relation with government and society that will avoid the dreary extremes of heavy dependence on changing public policies and the irrelevancies of a too exclusive and ivory tower image of university involvement—that is the task of the modern university. Basic research we must have, but it will not be supported for long unless an understandable connection can be drawn to its possible application. Alfred North Whitehead has told us that knowledge not put to use will become sterile. We must reestablish the utility of basic research, the relevance of universal values, the humaneness of the humanities, the conscience of the social sciences, and the social concern of the professions. As we move in this direction we will ensure the continued flowering of a graduate education that is indispensable to our students and our society.



40

# Commentary

Bertil Östergren
Chairman,
Swedish Committee for
Internationalizing
University Education

Having been asked to comment upon the essays of Francis X. Sutton, F. Champion Ward and James A. Perkins, it is fruitful to start by comparing previous motives for international studies in the United States and Sweden.

One of the motivations in the United States, as described by James Perkins and Champion Ward, was the international leadership of the nation, or as some may prefer to denote it, its "neo-imperialism." Another motive, perhaps not clearly distinguishable from the first one, was the commitment to development assistance.

During the 1960s international studies at university level in Sweden were impelled by two main motives. One was the need of the export industry for qualified manpower with knowledge of other countries, their economy and languages. While Sweden cannot have ambitions for international

leadership, its economy is highly internationally dependent, relatively much more than that of the United States. The other motive was development assistance. The idea was that young Swedes should be trained at universities directly for development work and that they then were to go to countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America and teach their inhabitants how to live and work. The Swedish International Development Authority was to become one of Sweden's largest employers, and this perspective offered some consolation to university graduates at a time when national labor market conditions appeared rather gloomy for many of them.

When the national authority for higher education (the Office of the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities) appointed a committee in early 1972 to draft proposals for internationalizing university curricula, its terms of reference were based on these two motives. But it did not take the committee much time to change the perspective radically.[1]

The committee has established one main motive for internationalizing education: it is necessary for the survival of mankind. The consequence is that the main objective for an internationalized education must be international solidarity and a sense of world citizenship.

Behind this change in outlook lies the recognition of the inevitable and growing international interdependence in all fields of life. The possibility of global crises concerning population, natural resources, environment and so on, has helped us to understand that education must foster a common responsibility for the earth and its inhabitants.

---

[1] The committee, after having published five reports, has finished its work in 1974. An English Summary of the reports will appear in October 1974 and can be obtained from the Office of the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities, Box 16334, S-103 26 Stockholm 16, Sweden.

With that as our point of departure, subordinate importance attaches to other, more special motives for international studies. Of course the educational system must cater to the needs of the export industry, but this is seen as one aspect of global interdependence. Of course the problems of the developing countries are crucial also for education in the industrialized parts of the world, but not in the naive form of training young people for a career as development assistance workers. Of course special national demands must be taken care of, but the dominating aspect must be that of survival in which national and international interests converge.

In many senses this could be called a "total" view on the internationalization of education. The international aspects must permeate all levels of the educational system; even if the original task of the Swedish committee was only university education, the committee found it unavoidable to discuss and make proposals also in respect of the preschool, primary and secondary levels.

At university level international education must not be restricted to the training of certain groups of prospective international specialists. An international dimension should be introduced in all studies; all students will, in one way or another, become participants in international developments. And the international dimension will, furthermore, make them better qualified to solve purely domestic problems; Francis Sutton has expressed this very clearly when he writes that "experience with both advanced and developing countries should in this way be no mere appendage to the study of these subjects in the United States, but an organic part of deepened and more generalized approaches to them."

The international dimension must permeate all activities of the university. The Swedish committee has made proposals in respect of research, training of research workers, contents of

undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate education, teacher training, language training, international exchange of students and teachers, administration, allocation of resources, etc.

The committee gives highest priority to the following fields: teacher training, introducing a global dimension in all curricula, language training, international exchange of students and teachers.

The reason why teacher training is given high priority is apparent: it is the most important means of internationalizing school education. In Sweden this applies particularly to further training of teachers, because at the lower level of secondary schools, for instance, 80 percent of the teachers are under 40 years of age; the larger part of this century's teachers have already undergone their basic teacher training.

In his inaugural address to the European Conference of Ministers of Education in 1973, the Director-General of Unesco, René Maheu, said that the worst disadvantage of universities is their resistance to innovation. This is not just one man's personal opinion; in the debate about the functions of universities it is more and more recognized that this is the crucial point. The ability of universities to implement profound change and renewal is intolerably weak.

This is, of course, an obstacle to internationalizing education. When we talk about "introducing a global dimension in all curricula," it is apparent that we do not mean adding some book about foreign countries and cultures. We mean a radical change in outlook, a change which deeply affects the attitudes and value systems of teachers. As James Perkins points out, international studies often imply interdisciplinarity, and that is not easy to achieve in an institutional structure dominated by disciplines.

Language training is another example of the need for profound renewal. The language departments of universities

have traditionally devoted themselves to the training of language specialists, highly qualified in literature and linquistics. But now a new demand is added: short and effective language courses in the fields of engineering, natural sciences, social sciences, etc. This necessitates a change in ideals, objectives, methods, recruitment of staff and research orientations.

All this has led the Swedish committee into discussing university policy in general. Our belief is that it is hardly possible to realize the necessary internationalization of universities without structural changes which make the universities more apt to undertake innovations in general.

Champion Ward writes that it is time for internationalism in higher education to be grounded in the very idea of the university. The Swedish committee writes in its final report that internationalism *is* the very idea of a university: to search for and disseminate new knowledge irrespective of national boundaries and parochial restrictions. But, as Francis Sutton shows, this idea is always threatened by national, provincial and group interests. Measures to internationalize education will help universities to realize their very idea better than they have done.

But this also means that the universities themselves have to reconsider their position in society, give up many of their traditions within discipline-limited boundaries and see the earth as a whole as their working field and their responsibility. The universities have much to gain by introducing a total international dimension in all their activities. But to make these gains they have to sacrifice much of what they have regarded as axiomatic.

That is the challenge which international education offers to universities.

## International Council for Educational Development

The International Council for Educational Development (ICED) is an international non-profit association of persons with a common concern for the future of education and its role in social and economic development.

ICED's three major interests are strategies for educational development; the modernization and management of systems of higher education; and the international programs and responsibilities of higher education. In each area, ICED's purposes are to identify and analyze major educational problems shared by a number of countries, to generate policy recommendations, and to provide consultation, on request, to international and national organizations.

ICED's activities are directed by James A. Perkins, chief executive officer and chairman of an international board. Philip H. Coombs is vice chairman. The headquarters office is in New York City.

The main support for ICED to date has come from the Ford Foundation, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, UNICEF, and the Clark Foundation. Twelve national and international agencies are supporting ICED's 18-month study on Higher Education for Development.

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES

*James A. Perkins
Chairman of the Board

*Philip H. Coombs
Vice Chairman of the Board

Abbas M. Ammar
Former Deputy Director-General
International Labour Office
Geneva, Switzerland

Eric Ashby (Lord Ashby of Brandon)
Master of Clare College
Cambridge, England

Vincent M. Barnett, Jr.
James Phinney Baxter III
Professor of History and
Public Affairs
Williams College
Williamstown, Massachusetts

*Ernest L. Boyer
Chancellor
State University of New York
Albany, New York

*Harlan Cleveland
Director**
Aspen Program in
International Affairs
Princeton, New Jersey

Ricardo Díez Hochleitner
Director
Education and International
Programs
Fundación General Mediterránea
Madrid, Spain

*Alvin C. Eurich
President
Academy for Educational
Development
New York, New York

Edward K. Hamilton
President
Griffenhagen-Kroeger, Inc.
San Francisco, California

[illegible]pe Herrera
[illegible]niversidad Católica
Universidad de Chile
Santiago, Chile

Coordinator General
ECIEL Program
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Torsten Husén
Professor of International
Education
University of Stockholm
Stockholm, Sweden

*Lady Barbara Ward Jackson
President
International Institute for
Environmental Affairs
London, England

Henri Janne
Le Président du Collège
Scientifique
Institut de Sociologie
Université Libre de Bruxelles
Brussels, Belgium

Clark Kerr
Chairman
Carnegie Council on Policy
Studies in Higher Education
Berkeley, California

Max Kohnstamm
President
European University Institute
Florence, Italy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Peter F. Krogh
Dean
School of Foreign Service
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

Alex A. Kwapong
Vice-Chancellor
University of Ghana
Legon, Ghana

Hans Leussink
Former Minister of
Education and Science
Karlsruhe, West Germany

Sol M. Linowitz
Coudert Brothers
Washington, D.C.

Robert S. McNamara
President
International Bank for
Reconstruction and
Development
Washington, D.C.

Martin Meyerson
President
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Michio Nagai
Member
Editorial Board
The Asahi-Shimbun Press
Tokyo, Japan

*Alfonso Ocampo Londoño
President
Fundación para el
Desarrollo Industrial
Cali, Colombia

Paola Coppola Pignatelli
Professor of Architectural
Design
University of Rome
Rome, Italy

*Joseph E. Slater
President
Aspen Institute for
Humanistic Studies
New York, New York

Jan Szczepanski
Director
Instytut Filozofii
Polska Akademia Nauk
Warsaw, Poland

Puey Ungphakorn
Faculty of Economics
Thammasat University
Bangkok, Thailand

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Member of the Executive Committee
**Effective September 1, 1974